

# Envision Carlsbad Citizens Committee

## Minutes

August 10, 2011

1635 Faraday Avenue, Carlsbad  
Room 173B

### **Committee Present**

#### **Primary Members**

Eric Larsen (Chair)	Jim Farley (Co Chair)	Julie Baker
Robert Gates	Gina McBride	Diane Proulx
Fred Sandquist	Allen Sweet	

#### **Alternate Members**

Jack Cumming	Jim Bradley
--------------	-------------

Absent: Sean Bentley (Primary), Jim Comstock (Primary), Kirk Cowles (Primary), Glen Etherington (Alternate), Barbara Hamilton (Primary), Mike Howes (Primary), Chris Korogi (Alternate), Hap L'Heureux (Primary), Greg Nelson (Primary), Robert Nielsen (Alternate), John O'Reilly (Primary), Guy Roney (Alternate), Tina Schmidt (Alternate), Sean Sexton (Alternate), Jeff Segall (Primary), Dr. Anne Spacie (Alternate), Jeannie Sprague-Bentley (Primary)

#### **City of Carlsbad Staff**

*Gary Barberio – Community & Economic Development Director*

*Don Neu – City Planner*

*David de Cordova – Principal Planner*

*Chris DeCerbo – Principal Planner*

*Jennifer Jesser – Senior Planner*

*Leticia Treviño – Senior Office Specialist*

#### **Consultant**

*Rajeev Bhatia – Dyett & Bhatia*

Committee Chairperson Larsen called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

#### **1. Approve Minutes of the May 11, 2011 meeting**

There was a motion to approve with one correction. The minutes stated there was no public comment. The public participated with the committee during the discussion of the focus areas. Separate time for public comment was allowed, but no one wanted to speak. The minutes from the May 11, 2011 meeting were approved as amended by the committee (Farley abstained).

#### **2. Overview of Council approved changes to the scope of work**

Staff reviewed with the Committee the work program changes approved by the City Council on July 26<sup>th</sup>. Notable changes include wrapping up the Committee's work with

completion of Task 3 (Preferred Plan), phasing adoption of the General Plan, Zoning Code and LCP, reducing the overall schedule by 4 ½ months, and program costs by about \$140,000.

### **3. Alternatives Process**

Consultant Rajeev Bhatia gave the Committee a presentation on the alternatives process.

### **4. Overview of Alternative Plan Concepts**

Mr. Bhatia indicated each concept will not achieve every criterion laid out in the vision. They will meet certain themes and the committee will have the opportunity to pick and choose what they like from the different concepts, or come up with new ideas. The goal for the meeting is to make sure that all brainstorming ideas from previous meetings were captured in at least one of the concepts.

Concept A - Centers. Development will be directed to the centers. The most major center is the Village. Under this concept, new neighborhood centers will be strategically placed to improve walkability and connections into neighborhoods, access to shopping and services, and open space. Each center is based on a ½-mile walking radius.

A Committee member asked why the Rancho Santa Fe Road and La Costa Avenue intersection is not a center.

Consultant and staff responded that the approach is not to show all existing centers or anticipated centers under the General Plan, but to identify where there are opportunities for improvement.

Concept B - Active Waterfront. This concept tries to improve commercial and activity centers along the waterfront, as well as accessibility and walkability. There is opportunity for a pedestrian promenade with a realigned Carlsbad Boulevard, and even a notion of a pier. The concept includes opportunities for additional housing such as at Ponto and the power plant site. Since more housing is shifted to the coast under this concept, parcels along El Camino Real can stay the same with their commercial uses.

Concept C - Core Focus. The concept explores land use opportunities in and around the Palomar Airport Road work center. There is opportunity for adding residential and commercial uses to this area so it does not get deserted at night and people can live closer to work. Transportation will be improved. The notion is to collect the density in this core.

### **5. EC3 Conversation about Alternatives Plan Concepts**

Focus Area 1 (Northwest Coastal). Barrio is considered in all three alternatives. The Village is similar in all three concepts. The primary differences occur at the power plant site. There will be more mixed uses.

A Committee member asked whether the alternatives are mutually exclusive or can they blend various elements of all three. Consultant responded that the Committee's task is to make sure the ideas from the previous brainstorming session have been captured in at least one of the alternatives; it's not necessary to mesh all the ideas at this time.

The Committee previously talked about connectivity between areas 1, 2, and 3. Maps show some trail, but does not address connectivity. There are no walkways to the ocean shown,

no greenbelts along the creek and into Buena Vista Lagoon. Consultant responded that whatever preferred land use option emerges, there will be an improved transportation system to go with it. Transportation plans are not shown in the maps yet. They will be developed later in the process.

A Committee member commented that the Village is not called out as a business center, with civic uses, a city hall, etc. Staff responded that the maps are intended to present general land use concepts rather than specific in-the-ground uses.

To improve the Committee's understanding, it was suggested that the Maps be viewed as a kind of overlay: existing areas (shaded gray) are not proposed for change, existing residential neighborhoods don't change, nor do the open spaces areas disappear.

Some Committee members questioned the appropriateness of residential use on the power plant site, due to its proximity to the railroad tracks and freeway. However, the Committee agreed mixed-use residential should remain on one of the alternatives for evaluation purposes and to gauge community response.

A committee member inquired whether the public will be asked to select A, B, or C as their preferred alternative, because there are good ideas in all three. The consultant and staff responded that the format for presenting the alternatives to the public has not yet been decided, but it is expected people will be able to say what they like about all three. The purpose of the Committee's review at this point is to identify whether an alternative land use is totally off base or missing from the previous brainstorming sessions.

Committee members suggested there should be more open space shown on the power plant site.

Focus Area 2 – Plaza Camino Real Commercial Corridor – calls for mixed use with more housing and a commercial component.

The Committee Chair asked whether there is anything not mentioned or offered as an option.

The Committee extended their discussion about the boundaries (drawn in green) of Focus Areas 1, 2, 3. Visually, there lacked connectivity among the areas. It was suggested that the boundaries be redrawn such that the Village and Plaza Camino Real and Quarry Creek become a single opportunity area. Consultant and staff reiterated that there was no significance to how the area boundaries were drawn other than to organize them for discussion purposes. The lines should not be viewed as hard boundaries or "walls", and should not imply a lack of connectivity between areas. The consultant suggested that other maps showing transportation linkages among the areas could be made available at the public workshops. The Committee Chair advised that the purpose of the focus area boundaries should be made clear to the public.

The consultant asked whether one of the alternatives should omit residential for this focus area. The Committee agreed that all three alternatives should include some residential use.

A Committee member noted that there is no indication of land uses beyond the city's border, and wondered whether land use in adjacent cities was being considered. Staff responded that it has been taken into some consideration. The Centers concept, for

example, suggests more residential in areas close to existing commercial areas at the border with Vista and Oceanside.

Focus Area 3 – Quarry Creek – includes an idea for a college campus as well as open space along the creek.

There was a question about whether the proximity to Mira Costa was taken into account or other sites considered. The consultant responded that the Planning Commission considered Focused Areas 3 and 7; they chose Focus Area 3.

The Committee agreed that the campus concept should alternatively be considered further south such as near the airport.

Focus Area 4 – Marja Acres

No comment.

Focus Area 5 – Sunny Creek Commercial

No comment

Focus Area 6 – Mandana – shown as very low density residential in all three alternatives. The Committee Chair asked whether public comment was needed if the land uses are all the same. The consultant responded that it is shown as a focus area because it is the largest areas of undeveloped land with no master plan. The feedback from EC3 and Planning Commission is that this area may need to be considered to meet state housing needs.

The Committee agreed to keep it as a focus area.

Focus Area 7 – Palomar Corridor (A) – largest area. Centers should be adjacent to core area. Palomar Corridor (B) – Waterfront – just has employment. (C) – has greater mixed uses.

One of the alternatives should show a college campus on Palomar Airport Road or El Camino where there is transportation.

A Committee member questioned whether there was enough commercial use (shown in red) given the great concern there is not enough commercial to support the industrial/office area. The consultant responded that it is challenging putting commercial use in an area that just has a daytime market. So only the mixed-use areas with more residential can have more commercial. Staff clarified that the mixed-use areas shown in purple would allow commercial uses.

Focus Area 8 – Southern Freeway Corridor

There was some discussion about the graphic depiction of a pier in Concept B, Area 1 and whether it should be shown further south. The proposed location seems incompatible with the power plant use. The consultant responded that the pier should be located where the most number of people would gather. Also, the consultant reminded the Committee to consider what the power plant site will be in 30 years.

The Chair commented that a pier should be an option, but it is not a land use. He suggested that a comment be added to the map that the pier is conceptual and that its location is not specified yet.

In response to the Committee's question about the different colors on the maps, the consultant clarified that the darker pink sites are opportunity sites, areas that are likely to (re)develop in the next 30 years. The light pink areas represent where continued employment and intensification will happen. He stated the map legend can be modified to clarify this.

Focus Area 9 – Ponto Southern Waterfront

The Committee requested that the area of the state campgrounds (shown in gray) be better identified.

Focus Area 10 – Aviara

No comments.

Focus Area 11 – South El Camino Real

A Committee member wanted to clarify that the gray area west of El Camino real is open space. Staff confirmed that it is open space and is shown in gray because it is not considered to be an opportunity area; that is, no change in use from open space is proposed.

**6. Next Steps**

The consultant explained that there will be some transportation and walkability analysis performed before the workshops.

The Committee requested that draft minutes be made available prior to the public workshops, considering the Committee will not meet again until mid-February

The Consultant stated the public workshops will be held in November.

**7. Public Comment**

A number of speakers addressed the Committee.

One speaker noted that it's unclear what already exists on the alternatives maps. There should be clear overlays showing what is existing. Overlays can show sensitive lands, zoning, Habitat Management Plan, and open space. There should be a note that Marron Road can never be developed since it is an ecological reserve area. Regarding Car Country (Focus Area 8, Concept A), that area is already Car Country, it's confusing why it is showing as proposed commercial development when it is already developed.

How the community meetings are structured is critical since there is a tremendous amount of information to digest at once. Parks, open space, and trails have always been a priority to the public but there does not seem to be an increase in the proposed changes. Speaker is concerned with densities shown at the Quarry Creek site. The City of Oceanside is already on record expressing concern. Consider an alternative without the density.

There was a question about where the upcoming workshops will take place, at City Hall or in the focus areas. The Committee Chair clarified that there will be two community-wide meetings, not meetings in each of the focus area.

A speaker advocated for having curbside recycling of green waste not sent to a landfill but to a compost facility in Carlsbad. Methane gas in the landfills is a significant source of greenhouse gas. There needs to be more sustainable water practices.

Keep agriculture in Focus Area 6. It was proposed but it's not shown on any of the alternatives.

A speaker questioned how the city can complete a comprehensive EIR for the General Plan update in 1-1/2 years. The consultant responded that it will not be a project specific, but a program-level EIR.

All three land use concepts are just pushing development. Surveys support more open space. Prop C is not being used to acquire more open space, even though funds were collected.

A speaker expressed concern that city will not be ready by November to present the land use plans, finds the information to be confusing and questioned how it will be presented to the public.

Consultant stated that this Committee meeting was not intended as a public workshop, and that they will do their best to bring the public up to speed at the upcoming workshops. The Committee Chair clarified that it's still early in the process and there will more public workshops and opportunities for comment in the future.

The owners of Marja Acres addressed the Committee about their property, supporting commercial use and expressing concern about proposed residential use. The property is affected by topographic features. The lower portion will be heavily impacted by El Camino Real when it is widened to six lanes. Site configuration may make residential sites on Alternatives A and B problematic. Marja Acres has had a commercial component since the 1960s, currently employing 75 people.

A speaker addressed Carlsbad's commitment to sustainability, reminding the Committee of three parts to sustainability: social, economic, and environmental. There is too much focus on economic and not enough on the environment and social components. The city has missed some great opportunities in open space. Community gardens should be encouraged.

A representative from McMillan stated they were processing a master plan for Quarry Creek and recognizes their planning process is converging with the General Plan update process. He offered to give the Committee a presentation on their master plan.

## **8. Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.